



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|-------------|----------------------|-------------------------------|------------------|
| 10/734,039 | 12/11/2003 | John Charles Kath | PC25339A | 8724 |
| 23913 | 7590 | 12/07/2005 | EXAMINER | |
| PFIZER INC 150 EAST 42ND STREET 5TH FLOOR - STOP 49 NEW YORK, NY 10017-5612 | | | BALASUBRAMANIAN, VENKATARAMAN | |
| | | ART UNIT | | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | | 1624 |

DATE MAILED: 12/07/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | | | |
|------------------------------|--|---------------------|--|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
| | 10/734,039 | KATH ET AL. | |
| | Examiner Venkataraman Balasubramanian | Art Unit 1624 | |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 December 2003.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____. |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>7/6/04, 10/14/052</u> . | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____. |

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-30 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The following apply. Any claim not specifically rejected is rejected as it dependent on a rejected claim and shares the same indefiniteness.

1. Recitation of "prodrug thereof" in claim 1 & claim 24 renders these claims and the dependent claims 2-23 and 25-30 indefinite. Prodrugs in general and as noted in specification, are compounds, which undergo in vivo hydrolysis to parent active drugs. In that sense recitation of prodrug is acceptable. However, the definition of various variable groups include such groups, namely esters, amides, alkoxy carbonyl etc. and therefore it is not clear what is the difference between these variable groups and the prodrug groups. There is clear-cut ambiguity as to what is to be considered as prodrug and what is not. Applicants should note that if the variable groups are prodrug, which are in general inactive but becomes active upon in vivo transformation, then the compound bearing the variable group would be deemed as inactive which is not what the claim recites.

Furthermore, the issue on second paragraph is whether the structures of the claimed compounds are clearly defined. Applicants' "prodrugs" are molecules whose structure lie outside the subject matter of formula (I), but upon metabolism in the body are converted to active compounds falling within the structural scope of formula (I). The claim describes the function intended but provides no specific structural guidance to what constitutes a "prodrug". Structural formulas, names, or both can accurately describe organic compounds, which are the subject matter of claim 1. Attempting to define means by function is not proper when the means can be clearly expressed in terms that are more precise.

2. Claim 17 is an improper dependent claim. Note claim 17 is dependent on claim 1 and claims 11-16. Note Markush choices should be in alternate form.

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for making salts of the claimed compounds, does not reasonably provide enablement for making prodrug of the claimed compounds. The claim(s) contains subject matter that was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art of medicinal chemistry - to use the invention. "The factors to be considered in making an enablement rejection have been summarized as the quantity of experimentation necessary, the amount of direction or guidance presented, the presence or absence of working examples, the nature of the

invention, the state of the prior art, the relative skill of those in that art, the predictability or unpredictability of the art and the breadth of the claims", In re Rainer, 146 USPQ 218 (1965); In re Colianni, 195 USPQ 150, Ex parte Formal, 230 USPQ 546. Finding a prodrug is an empirical exercise. Predicting if a certain ester of a claimed alcohol, for example, is in fact a prodrug, and produces the active compound metabolically, in man, at a therapeutic concentration and at a useful rate is filled with experimental uncertainty. Although attempts have been made to predict drug metabolism 'de novo, this is still an experimental science. For a compound to be a prodrug, it must meet three tests. It must itself be biologically inactive. It must be metabolized to a second substance in a human at a rate and to an extent to produce that second substance at a physiologically meaningful concentration. Thirdly, that second substance must be biologically active. Thus, determining whether a particular compound meets these three criteria in a clinical trial setting requires a large quantity of experimentation.

The recitation of prodrug is found in page 32 the passage spanning line 23-25. There is no working example of a prodrug of a compound the formula (I). The nature of the invention is clinical use of compounds and the pharmacokinetic behavior of substances in the human body. The state of the prodrug art is summarized by Wolff (Medicinal Chemistry). The table on the left side of page 976 outlines the research program to be undertaken to find a prodrug. The second paragraph in section 10 and the paragraph spanning pages 976-977 indicate the low expectation of success. In that paragraph the difficulties of extrapolating between species are further developed. Since, the prodrug concept is a pharmacokinetic issue, the lack of any standard pharmacokinetic protocol

discussed in the last sentence of this paragraph is particularly relevant. Banker (*Modem Pharmaceutics*) in the first sentence, third paragraph on page 596 states that "extensive development must be undertaken" to find a prodrug. Wolff (*Medicinal Chemistry*) in the last paragraph on page 975 describes the artisans making Applicants' prodrugs as a collaborative team of synthetic pharmaceutical chemists and metabolism experts. All would have a Ph. D. degree and several years of industrial experience. It is well established that "the scope of enablement varies inversely degree of unpredictability of the factors involved", 'and physiological activity is generally considered to be an unpredictable factor. See *In re Fisher*, 427 F.2d 833, 839, 166 USPQ 18, 24 (CCPA 1970). The breadth of the claims includes all of the millions of compounds of formula of claim I as well as the presently unknown list potential prodrug derivatives embraced by the word "prodrug".

Thus, undue experimentation will be required to determine if any particular derivative is, in fact, a prodrug.

MPEP 2164.01(a) states, "A conclusion of lack of enablement means that, based on the evidence regarding each of the above factors, the specification, at the time the application was filed, would not have taught one skilled in the art how to make and/or use the full scope of the claimed invention without undue experimentation. *In re Wright*, 999 F.2d 1557, 1562, 27 USPQ2d 1510, 1513 (Fed. Cir. 1993)." That conclusion is clearly justified here. Thus, undue experimentation will be required to make Applicants' invention.

Claims 1-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for making pharmaceutically acceptable salts does not reasonably provide enablement for making solvate or hydrate. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims. The following apply.

In evaluating the enablement question, several factors are to be considered. Note *In re Wands*, 8 USPQ2d 1400 and *Ex parte Forman*, 230 USPQ 546. The factors include: 1) The nature of the invention, 2) the state of the prior art, 3) the predictability or lack thereof in the art, 4) the amount of direction or guidance present, 5) the presence or absence of working examples, 6) the breadth of the claims, and 7) the quantity of experimentation needed.

1. The nature of the invention and the state of the prior art:

The invention is drawn to compound of formula I, or a pharmaceutically acceptable salt solvate or hydrate thereof. Specification is not adequately enabled as to how to make hydrate of compounds of formula (I). Specification has no example of hydrate of the instant compounds. Specification on page 32, lines 23-25 recites solvate or hydrate thereof but there is no enabling of such compounds.

The compound of formula I embrace 2,4-substituted amino-5-trifluoromethyl-pyrimidine compounds substituted with variable groups D, E, G, W, X, Y, Z, R¹, R², R³, R⁴ and R⁵.

Even a cursory calculation of the number of compounds embraced in the instant formula (I) based on the generic definition of alkyl., aryl heteroaryl, heterocyclyl, substituted aryl, heteroaryl, arylalkyloxy, arylalkylthio etc would result in millions and millions of compounds. This is of course not the accurate number and the true number of compounds would far exceed this number of compounds. Thus the genus embraced in the claim 1 is too large and there is no teaching of any solvate or hydrate of this large genus.

Search in the pertinent art, including water as solvent resulted in a pertinent reference, which is indicative of unpredictability of hydrate formation in general. The state of the art is that is not predictable whether solvates or hydrates will form or what their composition will be. In the language of the physical chemist, a hydrate of organic molecule is an interstitial solid solution. This phrase is defined in the second paragraph on page 358 of West (Solid State Chemistry). The solvent molecule is a species introduced into the crystal and no part of the organic host molecule is left out or replaced. In the first paragraph on page 365, West (Solid State Chemistry) says, "it is not usually possible to predict whether solid solutions will form, or if they do form what is the compositional extent". Thus, in the absence of experimentation one cannot predict if a particular solvent will solvate any particular crystal. One cannot predict the stoichiometry of the formed solvate, i.e. if one, two, or a half a molecule of solvent added per molecule of host. Compared with polymorphs, there is an additional degree of freedom to hydrates, which means a different solvent or even the moisture of the air that might change the stable region of the hydrate. In the instant case of hydrate a

similar reasoning therefore apply. Water is a solvent and hence it is held that a pertinent detail of West, which relates to solvates, is also applicable to hydrate

In addition, an additional search resulted in Vippagunta et al., Advanced Drug Delivery Reviews 48: 3-26, 2001, which clearly states that formation of hydrates is unpredictable. See entire document especially page 18, right column section 3.4. Note Vippagunta et al., states "Each solid compound responds uniquely to the possible formation of solvates or hydrates and hence generalizations cannot be made for series of related compounds".

2. The predictability or lack thereof in the art:

Hence, the solvate and hydrate as applied to the above-mentioned compounds claimed by the applicant are not art-recognized compounds and hence there should be adequate enabling disclosure in the specification with working example(s).

3. The amount of direction or guidance present:

Examples illustrated in the experimental section are limited to making the compounds not related to solvates and hydrates. There is no example of a solvate or hydrate of instant compound. Over 260 compounds were shown in the examples of the specification each of which has come in contact with water and other solvent but there is no showing that instant compounds formed solvates or hydrates. Hence it is clear that merely bring the compound with solvent or water does not result in solvate or hydrate and additional direction or guidance is needed to make them Specication has no such direction or guidance.

4. The presence or absence of working examples:

There is no working example of any solvate or hydrate formed. The claims are drawn to hydrate, yet the numerous examples presented all failed to produce a solvate or hydrate or even hydrate. These cannot be simply willed into existence. As was stated in Morton International Inc. v. Cardinal Chemical Co., 28 USPQ2d 1190 "The specification purports to teach, with over fifty examples, the preparation of the claimed compounds with the required connectivity. However ... there, is no evidence that such compounds exist... the examples of the '881 patent do not produce the postulated compounds... there is ...' no evidence that such compounds even exist." The same circumstance appears to be true here. There is no evidence that hydrates of these compounds actually exists; if they did, they would have formed. Hence, there should be showing supporting that solvates and hydrates of these compounds exist and therefore can be made.

5. The breadth of the claims & the quantity of experimentation needed:

Speciation has no support, as noted above, for compounds generically embraced in the claim 1 would lead to desired solvate and hydrate of the compound of formula I. As noted above, the genus embraces over million compounds and hence the breadth of the claim is broad. The quantity of experimentation needed would be an undue burden on skilled art in the chemical art since there is inadequate guidance given to the skilled artisan for the many reasons stated above. Even with the undue burden of experimentation, there is no guarantee that one would get the product of desired hydrate of compound of formula I embraced in the instant claims in view of the pertinent reference teachings.

MPEP 2164.01(a) states, "A conclusion of lack of enablement means that, based on the evidence regarding each of the above factors, the specification, at the time the application was filed, would not have taught one skilled in the art how to make and/or use the full scope of the claimed invention without undue experimentation. In re Wright, 999 F.2d 1557,1562, 27 USPQ2d 1510, 1513 (Fed. Cir. 1993)." That conclusion is clearly justified here. Thus, undue experimentation will be required to make Applicants' invention.

Claims 25-30 are rejected under U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification while being enabling for treating breast cancer, does not reasonably provide enablement for treating any or all abnormal cell growth or any or all cancers. . The specification does not enable any physician skilled in the art of medicine, to use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

The instant method of use claims 25-29 are drawn to "treatment of abnormal cell growth" by inhibiting receptor tyrosine kinases in general and the pharmaceutical composition claim 30 with intended use to "treatment of abnormal cell growth" in general.

As recited, claims 25-30 are reach through claims. Reach through claims, in general have a format drawn to mechanistic, receptor binding or enzymatic functionality and thereby reach through any or all diseases, disorders or conditions for which they lack written description and enabling disclosure in the specification. In the instant case, because of inhibition of tyrosine kinase activity in general by compound formula I, it is recited that instant compounds are useful for treatment of any or all abnormal growth

or cancers, for which there is no adequate written description and enabling disclosure in the instant specification.

The scope of the claims includes any or all cancer or any or all proliferative diseases due to receptor tyrosine kinase inhibition including those yet to be discovered as due said mode of action for which there is no enabling disclosure. In addition, the scope of these claims includes treatment of various cancers including group consisting of lung cancer, bone cancer, pancreatic cancer, skin cancer, cancer of the head or neck, cutaneous or intraocular melanoma, uterine cancer, ovarian cancer, rectal cancer, cancer of the anal region, stomach cancer, colon cancer, breast cancer, uterine cancer, carcinoma of the fallopian tubes, carcinoma of the endometrium, carcinoma of the cervix, carcinoma of the vagina, carcinoma of the vulva, Hodgkin's disease, cancer of the esophagus, cancer of the small intestine, cancer of the endocrine system, cancer of the thyroid gland, cancer of the parathyroid gland, cancer of the adrenal gland, sarcoma of soft tissue, cancer of the urethra, cancer of the penis, prostate cancer, chronic or acute leukemia, lymphocytic lymphomas, cancer of the bladder, cancer of the kidney or ureter, renal cell carcinoma, carcinoma of the renal pelvis, neoplasms of the central nervous system (CNS), primary CNS lymphoma, spinal axis tumors, brain stem glioma, pituitary adenoma, or a combination of one or more of the foregoing cancers, which is not adequately enabled solely based on the activity of the compounds provided in the specification. The instant compounds are disclosed to have receptor tyrosine kinase inhibitory activity and it is recited that the instant compounds are therefore useful in treating any or all diseases stated above for which applicants provide no competent

evidence. It appears that the applicants are asserting that the embraced compounds because of their mode action as tyrosine kinase inhibitor that would be useful for all sorts of abnormal growth related diseases (proliferative diseases) and cancers. However, the applicants have not provided any competent evidence that the instantly disclosed tests are highly predictive for all the uses disclosed and embraced by the claim language for the intended host. Moreover many if not most of diseases such as psoriasis, lung cancer, brain cancer, pancreatic cancer, colon cancer etc. are very difficult to treat and despite the fact that there are many anticancer drugs.

The scope of the claims involves millions of compounds of claim 1 as well as the thousand of diseases embraced by the terms an abnormal cell growth and cancer.

Abnormal growth related disease would include benign tumors, malignant tumors, polyps, lumps, lesions, other pre-cancerous conditions, psoriasis, leukemia, the hyper proliferation of the gastric epithelium caused by the Helicobacter pylori infection of ulcers.

Cancer is just an umbrella term. Tumors vary from those so benign that they are never treated to those so virulent that all present therapy is useless.

No compound has ever been found to treat proliferative diseases of all types generally.. Since this assertion is contrary to what is known in medicine, proof must be provided that this revolutionary assertion has merits. The existence of such a "compound" is contrary to our present understanding of oncology. Cecil Textbook of Medicine states, "each specific type has unique biologic and clinical features that must be appreciated for proper diagnosis, treatment and study" (see the enclosed article,

page 1004). Different types of cancers affect different organs and have different methods of growth and harm to the body. Thus, it is beyond the skill of oncologists today to get an agent to be effective against cancers generally. Note substantiation of utility and its scope is required when utility is "speculative", "sufficiently unusual" or not provided. See *Ex parte Jovanovics*, 211 USPQ 907, 909; *In re Langer* 183 USPQ 288. Also note *Hoffman v. Klaus* 9 USPQ 2d 1657 and *Ex parte Powers* 220 USPQ 925 regarding type of testing needed to support in vivo uses.

Next, applicant's attention is drawn to the Revised Utility and Written Description Guidelines, at 66 FR 1092-1099, 2001 wherein it is emphasized that 'a claimed invention must have a specific and substantial utility'. The disclosure in the instant case is not sufficient to enable the instantly claimed method treating solely based on the inhibitory activity disclosed for the compounds. The state of the art is indicative of the requirement for undue experimentation. See Mass, R. D., *Int. J. Radiation Oncology Bio. Phys.* Vol. 58(3): 932-940, 2004 and Fabbro et al. *Pharmacology & therapeutics* 93, 79-98, 2002.

In evaluating the enablement question, several factors are to be considered. Note *In re Wands*, 8 USPQ2d 1400 and *Ex parte Forman*, 230 USPQ 546. The factors include: 1) The nature of the invention, 2) the state of the prior art, 3) the predictability or lack thereof in the art, 4) the amount of direction or guidance present, 5) the presence or absence of working examples, 6) the breadth of the claims, and 7) the quantity of experimentation needed.

- 1) The nature of the invention: Therapeutic use of the compounds in treating disorders/diseases that require receptor tyrosine kinase inhibitory activity.
- 2) The state of the prior art: Recent publications expressed that the receptor tyrosine kinase inhibition effects are unpredictable and are still exploratory. See Mass et al. and Fabbro et al., cited above especially the concluding paragraph.
- 3) The predictability or lack thereof in the art: Applicants have not provided any competent evidence or disclosed tests that are highly predictive for the pharmaceutical use for treating any or all cancers or abnormal cell growth of the instant compounds. Pharmacological activity in general is a very unpredictable area. Note that in cases involving physiological activity such as the instant case, "the scope of enablement obviously varies inversely with the degree of unpredictability of the factors involved". See *In re Fisher*, 427 F.2d 833, 839, 166 USPQ 18, 24 (CCPA 1970).
- 4) The amount of direction or guidance present and 5) the presence or absence of working examples: Specification has no working examples to show treating any or all cancers or abnormal cell growth and the state of the art is that the effects of tyrosine kinase inhibitors are unpredictable.
- 6) The breadth of the claims: The instant claims embrace any or all abnormal growth related diseases and cancers including those yet to be related to tyrosine kinase.
- 7) The quantity of experimentation needed would be an undue burden to one skilled in the pharmaceutical arts since there is inadequate guidance given to the skilled artisan, regarding the pharmaceutical use, for the reasons stated above.

Thus, factors such as "sufficient working examples", "the level of skill in the art" and "predictability", etc. have been demonstrated to be sufficiently lacking in the instant case for the instant method claims. In view of the breadth of the claims, the chemical nature of the invention, the unpredictability of enzyme-inhibitor interactions in general, and the lack of working examples regarding the activity of the claimed compounds towards treating the variety of diseases of the instant claims, one having ordinary skill in the art would have to undergo an undue amount of experimentation to use the instantly claimed invention commensurate in scope with the claims.

MPEP §2164.01(a) states, "A conclusion of lack of enablement means that, based on the evidence regarding each of the above factors, the specification, at the time the application was 'filed, would not have taught one skilled in the art how to make and/or use the full scope of the claimed invention without undue experimentation. In re Wright, 999 F.2d 1557,1562, 27 USPQ2d 1510, 1513 (Fed. Cir. 1993)." That conclusion is clearly justified here and undue experimentation will be required to practice Applicants' invention.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-23 and 25-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Dahmann et al., US2003/0171359.

Dahmann et al. teaches several 2,4-substituted aminopyrimidine compounds for treating abnormal cell growth, which includes instant compounds. See pages 1-5, formula 1 and note the definition of various variable groups R^a, R^b, R^c, R^d and R^e. Especially note with the given definition of R^a, R^b, R^c, R^d and R^e, compounds taught by Dahmann et al. include instant compounds. See entire document for further details. See pages 23-86 for large number of examples of compounds made. Note claims 25-30 are rejected as method of use of Dahmann et al. include breast cancer.

Claims 1-9 and 11-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Bornemann et al., US2005/0009853.

Bornemann et al. teaches several 2,4-substituted aminopyrimidine compounds for treating illness due β-amyloid which include instant compounds. See pages 1-10, formula 1 and note the definition of various variable groups R^a, R^b, R^c, R^d and R^e. Especially note with the given definition of R^a, R^b, R^c, R^d and R^e, compounds taught by Bornemann et al. include instant compounds. See entire document for further details. See pages 18-25 for examples of compounds made. Especially see example 1, compound 43, 60, 70 and example 2, compound 16.

Claims 1-23 and 25-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Nagarathnam et al., WO 03/030909.

Nagarathnam et al. teaches several 2,4-substituted aminopyrimidine compounds for treating viral infection and cancer, which include instant compounds. See pages 3-

10, formula 1 and note the definition of various variable groups X, R² and R³. Especially note with the given definition of X, R² and R³, compounds taught by Nagarathnam et al. include instant compounds. See entire document for further details. See pages 27-87 including Table 1-3 for large number of examples of compounds made. Note claims 25-30 are rejected as method of use of Nagarathnam et al. include breast cancer.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to

consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dahmann et al., US2003/0171359.

Teachings of Dahmann et al. as discussed in the above 102 rejection is incorporated herein. As noted above, Dahmann et al. teaches several 2,4 substituted aminopyrimidine compounds for treating abnormal cell growth, which includes instant compounds. See pages 1-5, formula 1 and note the definition of various variable groups R^a, R^b, R^c, R^d and R^e. Especially note with the given definition of R^a, R^b, R^c, R^d and R^e, compounds taught by Dahmann et al. include instant compounds. See entire document for further details. See pages 23-86 for large number of examples of compounds made. Note claims 25-30 are rejected as method of use of Dahmann et al. include breast cancer.

Dahmann et al. differs from the instant claims in exemplifying only limited number of compounds of the genus claimed in page 1 for compound of formula I. However, Dahmann et al. teaches equivalency of those compounds taught in pages 23-86 with those generically recited in pages 1-5.

Thus it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to make compounds using the teachings of Dahmann et al and expect resulting compounds to possess the uses taught by the art in view of the equivalency teaching outline above.

Claims 1-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bornemann et al., US2005/0009853.

Teachings of Bornemann et al. as discussed in the above 102 rejection is incorporated herein. As noted above, Bornemann et al. teaches several 2,4-substituted aminopyrimidine compounds for treating illness due β -amyloid which include instant compounds. See pages 1-10, formula 1 and note the definition of various variable groups R^a , R^b , R^c , R^d and R^e . Especially note with the given definition of R^a , R^b , R^c , R^d and R^e , compounds taught by Bornemann et al. include instant compounds. See entire document for further details. See pages 18-25 for examples of compounds made. Especially see example 1, compound 43, 60, 70 and example 2, compound 16.

Bornemann et al. differs from the instant claims in not exemplifying all compounds generically embraced in the compound of formula I shown in page 1-10.

However, Bornemann et al. teaches equivalency of those compounds taught in pages 18-25 with those generically recited in pages 1-10.

Thus, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to make compounds using the teachings of Bornemann et al and expect resulting compounds to possess the uses taught by the art in view of the equivalency teaching outline above.

Claims 1-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nagarathnam et al., WO 03/030909.

Teachings of Nagarathnam et al. as discussed in the above 102 rejection is incorporated herein. As noted above, Nagarathnam et al. teaches several 2,4-

substituted aminopyrimidine compounds for treating viral infection and cancer, which include instant compounds. See pages 3-10, formula 1 and note the definition of various variable groups X, R² and R³. Especially note with the given definition of X, R² and R³, compounds taught by Nagarathnam et al. include instant compounds. See entire document for further details. See pages 27-87 including Table 1-3 for large number of examples of compounds made. Note claims 25-30 are rejected as method of use of Nagarathnam et al. include breast cancer.

Nagarathnam et al. differs from the instant claims in not exemplifying only all the compounds of the genus claimed in pages 3-10 for compound of formula I. However, Nagarathnam et al. teaches equivalency of those compounds taught in pages 27-87 with those generically recited in pages 3-10.

Thus it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to make compounds using the teachings of Nagarathnam et al and expect resulting compounds to possess the uses taught by the art in view of the equivalency teaching outline above.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-30 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-46 of copending Application No. 10/733215. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the subject matter embraced in the instant claims are also embraced in the copending application 10/733215. Note substituents in 2, 4 and 5 position of the instant claims overlap with those of the copending application.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claims 1-30 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-26 of copending Application No. 11/122515. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the subject matter embraced in the instant claims are also embraced in the copending application 11/122515 . Note the trifluoromethylpyrimidine with indol-2-one side chain attached through a NH embraced in the instant claims are claimed in the copending application.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claims 1-30 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-32 of

copending Application No. 11/127,676. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the subject matter embraced in the instant claims are also embraced in the copending application 11/127,676. Note substituents in 2, 4 and 5 position of the instant claims overlap with those of the copending application.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claims 1-30 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-27 of copending Application No. 11/124,006. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the subject matter embraced in the instant claims are also embraced in the copending application 11/124,006. Note substituents in 2, 4 and 5 position of the instant claims overlap with those of the copending application.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claims 1-30 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-17 of copending Application No. 11/127,809. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the subject matter embraced in the instant claims are also embraced in the copending application 11/127,809. Note

substituents in 2, 4 and 5 position of the instant claims overlap with those of the copending application.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication from the examiner should be addressed to Venkataraman Balasubramanian (Bala) whose telephone number is (571) 272-0662. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday from 8.00 AM to 6.00 PM. The Supervisory Patent Examiner (SPE) of the art unit 1624 is James O. Wilson, whose telephone number is 571-272-0661. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned (573) 273-8300. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-1600.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAG. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-2 17-9197 (toll-free).

Art Unit: 1624

Venkataraman Balasubramanian
Venkataraman Balasubramanian

12/1/2005